

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

|   |                       |                                 |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Theophalis (Binky) Wilson,<br>v.<br>City of Philadelphia, et al | :<br>:<br>:<br>:<br>: | CIVIL ACTION<br><br>NO. 21-2057 |
| Christopher Williams,<br>v.<br>City of Philadelphia, et al      | :<br>:<br>:<br>:<br>: | CIVIL ACTION<br><br>NO. 21-5268 |

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 27<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2022, upon consideration of the status conference held before this Court on April 21, 2022 and the agreement of all parties present during that conference, it is hereby ORDERED that the cases *Wilson v. City of Philadelphia et al.* 21-cv-02057 and *Williams v. City of Philadelphia et al.*, 21-cv-05268 be consolidated for the limited purposes of discovery.<sup>i</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**BY THE COURT:**

/s/ John Milton Younge

**JUDGE JOHN MILTON YOUNGE**

---

<sup>i</sup> Though the parties did not file a Motion to Consolidate, during a status conference held on April 21, 2022 all counsel of record requested and agreed to consolidation for discovery. The cases *Wilson v. City of Philadelphia et al.* 21-cv-02057 and *Williams v. City of Philadelphia et al.*, 21-cv-05268 contain substantially similar allegations filed against many of the same defendants. This Court has the discretion to consolidate actions that “involve a common question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). If the court finds that such a commonality exists, the court may “(1) join for hearing or trial any or all matters at issue in the actions; (2) consolidate the actions; or (3) issue any other orders to avoid unnecessary cost or delay.” *Id.* The court has broad discretion to determine if consolidation is appropriate. *Easterday v. Federated Mut. Ins. Co.*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36563, at \*2 (E.D. Pa. 2015). In its determination, the court must balance the advantages of judicial economy against the potential harm in delays,

---

additional expenses, jury confusion, or prejudice. *Farahmand v. Rumsfeld*, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22473, \*4 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 20, 2002). The Court finds it appropriate to consolidate these cases for the limited purposes of discovery under Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). These cases involve substantially similar underlying facts and legal theories. Consolidation in this matter furthers judicial convenience and efficiency. The potential for consolidation for trial will be reserved until a later date.